

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

January 31, 2005 LB 169

that they were extending too long or were inappropriately used, and that the city's authority to use revenue bonds should be curtailed. One of the reasons is a revenue bond doesn't go against taxes, it goes against the stand-alone revenue-generating practice of the city, so it has a tendency to be somewhat like a business. And to my knowledge, we've had no difficulty with cities who are managing the business-like operation of the revenue-generating facility and a revenue bond.

SENATOR REDFIELD: So currently we have municipalities that are using revenue bonds for operating expenses?

SENATOR LANDIS: If we are, I'm not familiar with it. The existing language would say...the existing authority that they have would say that they could have used it for acquiring, constructing, reconstructing, improving--I'm not sure exactly what that means, that's existing law--extending, equipping or furnishing. So the language that we have now is ambiguous, I think, at best. I do not know of expenses for operations currently, but they may exist.

SENATOR REDFIELD: Thank you very much. Thank you, Senator Cudaback. I return my time to the Chair.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Redfield. We're discussing the committee amendments to LB 169. Senator Friend, there are no lights on. You're recognized to close on those amendments, AM0013, if you care to. He waives closing. The question before the body is, shall the committee amendments offered by the Urban Affairs Committee be adopted to LB 169? All in favor of the motion vote aye; those opposed, nay. The question before the body is adoption of committee amendments. Have you all voted on the question who care to? Record please, Mr. Clerk.

ASSISTANT CLERK: 38 ayes, 0 nays on the adoption of committee amendments, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: The motion was successful. The amendments have been adopted. Anything further on the bill, Mr. Clerk?